

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9715

I would ignore the vast differences in conditions that prevail; but rather because I believe that some of these institutions are based on principles that are valid everywhere, that can be adapted to meet many diverse conditions.

I think I would rate, at the very top, general education for all of the people. Unless farmers are literate and informed they face almost insurmountable handicaps in achieving greater efficiency and higher levels of living. The one single input that has contributed the most to progress and economic growth in all fields, here in the United States, is popular education.

Higher education and research, so well illustrated by our land grant colleges, have made contributions of immeasurable value to our agricultural development. Our extension system has brought new knowledge to farmers in their own homes and their own communities. Our land grant colleges have already made a good start in helping the developing nations, and extension systems are being developed in many parts of the world.

Educational institutions from both developing and developed nations are represented here at this Congress. If our deliberations here can promote greater exchanges of ideas and knowledge, increased cooperation and assistance, great strides forward can result.

Further research and new knowledge, about the requirements for adequate nutrition and the efficient production of various foods to meet those requirements, will always be needed to meet our constantly expanding needs and goals. But, in the allocation of scarce resources for education it is important to remember that the foundation must rest on broad, general educational opportunity for all of the people. Early in our history, Thomas Jefferson cautioned the people of this Nation that "if you expect to be both ignorant and free you expect what never has been and never can be." Popular education is a basic requirement on which all other institutional development depends.

Economic institutions are also essential; and, if agricultural advance is to maximize its contribution to higher levels of living, institutions for the handling, transportation, storage, processing, marketing and distribution of food must also progress as agricultural productivity increases. As the cultivators of the land seek to raise their efficiency and productivity they need institutions that will assure adequate credit on favorable terms.

Among the institutions that can help to meet many development needs are cooperatives, one form of private enterprise through which members can pool their resources to help themselves. It is possible that cooperatives can contribute even more in the developing countries than they have in the United States. Laws enacted in this country since the 1920's have encouraged the development of farm cooperatives, and our foreign assistance legislation specifically provides for aid in developing cooperatives abroad.

One institution that has proved its worth by its results is the system of land tenure that is based on ownership and control by those who till the soil, and which, therefore, provides the farmer with a most powerful incentive to improved operations. No other incentive stimulates capital improvements on the land as well as the farmer's assurance that he owns those improvements. No other system has been able to produce the abundance of food that this one has demonstrated so effectively and dramatically. I commend it as emphatically as I know how.

In emphasizing the building of appropriate social and economic institutions as an indispensable part of programs of development, I do not intend to minimize the importance of the physical and material things. These

are essential. But they are also easier to come by. Without the right institutional framework they can be, and have been, used to exploit rather than develop the people themselves. In other words, physical progress and material resources do not necessarily in and of themselves, bring about abundance for all.

On the other hand, institutional development can bring abundance to areas where material resources are scarce. Some of the best-fed people in the world live in Norway, where the proportion of arable farmland is very low. Some of the people with the highest standards of living in the world live in Switzerland, a country rich in resources of beauty and people, but lacking in resources such as coal, iron, and petroleum.

If, out of this Congress, there can come a renewed awareness of the importance of institutions, a constructive sharing of experience in institutional development, and a determination to build the kind of institutions that will most surely and effectively build for abundance for all, then indeed this Congress will have been a success.

USE OF ABUNDANCE

A third roadblock along the road of progress toward plenty is the failure to make the most effective possible use of existing abundance, abundance available and at hand, to help to achieve greater abundance where scarcity still dominates. I refer to the abundance of technical knowledge as well as to the abundance of food.

We in the World Food Congress are challenged to a major effort to develop methods and consider plans and programs whereby the abundance of food that exists in part of the world can be used most effectively to promote the economic development that will create abundance for those where scarcity still dominates. In issuing this challenge I want to emphasize a clear recognition that the contribution of food as part of an assistance program is never a goal in itself. The goal of every developing nation is to be able to stand on its own feet. But food assistance can be a most powerful tool, a most effective instrument, in progress toward that goal. It is a tool that we have at hand, if we will only use it to best advantage.

Many of the developed nations, including the United States, can and do produce more food than can possibly be consumed by their own people. This productivity is increasing. As I stated earlier, projections indicate that if trends in 30 developed nations continue by the year 2000 they will be able to produce nearly twice the food that their populations can consume. Let us contrast this with projections for the developing nations.

Such projections cannot, of course, be made very specific, because of the tremendously wide variations in the developing countries, and because of the many differing and unpredictable factors that will influence rates of growth. However, it is possible to make certain generalizations on which most will agree.

The most optimistic picture for accelerated economic growth in the developing nations, in the aggregate, indicates that they can and will increase their own domestic food production. But the most optimistic predictions fail to give any assurance that, in the generation immediately ahead, they will be able to increase it fast enough to meet the increasing demand. This demand will be exceptionally high for several reasons.

First, the rate of population increase in most of these nations is very high, and will perhaps go higher before it can be expected to tend to stabilize. Production will have to increase substantially in order to just keep up with population—it will have to increase still faster if it is to meet real nutritional needs.

Second, as economic growth proceeds, real incomes will increase, and with each increase in income comes an increased demand for food. Unless enough food is available to meet the demands created by both increased numbers and higher incomes, the lack of food will become a significant factor limiting economic progress.

It is perhaps one of the most fortunate coincidences of history that at a time when the developing nations of the world are in a takeoff stage in which more food is desperately needed if they are to take off successfully—at that same period the developed nations are producing and can produce an abundance so great that it is sometimes embarrassing. It is up to us, from developed and developing countries alike, to take full advantage of this fortunate coincidence.

It will not be easy. We, in the United States, are eager to share with others in this conference the experience we have gained in the distribution of more than \$12 billion worth of food in our food for peace program during the past 9 years. We have learned that it is not easy to give away food. We have learned that careful planning and close cooperation with receiving nations is essential in order to insure that the food is used to best advantage both to allay hunger and to promote local development. We have learned of the fears of other food-exporting nations, and of our own commercial exporters, who are concerned lest food that is donated might diminish commercial demand. We have learned that however rigorously we avoid any such result it is still difficult to allay the fear. We have also learned how much depends on the capacity and ability of the receiving country to transport, store, distribute, and use the food it receives to best advantage.

We are only beginning to learn how effectively food aid can be used to promote economic growth directly. It has long been used, and should continue to be used, to relieve hunger in emergencies, and to prevent inflation in countries going through a stage of development I described earlier. Its use in school lunch and child feeding programs is an investment in the health and vigor of the rising generation, and is in a very real sense a capital investment in human resources. But it is only recently that we have begun to develop ways that food can be used as a direct input for economic growth.

Food is being used with dramatic success as part payment for work on labor incentive programs—irrigation, roadbuilding, the building of schools and other public facilities. It is being transformed into an investment that helps to build cooperatives and other forms of private enterprise. It is being used to help resettlement of farmers on new lands. It can be used to provide a high proportion of the capital investment required for the development of many programs essential for economic growth. Discussion, consultation and further experience can result in the improvement and extension of these methods of using available food as capital in improving agriculture and hastening economic development.

Let us, here at this Congress, determine to find new and better ways to use to greatest advantage this instrument of abundance that we have at hand. Let us determine to overcome the difficulties that lie in the way of its maximum use. This is a challenge to both the developing and the developed nations.

The highly productive nations are challenged to find better ways and develop better methods—by national, multinational and international means—by which agricultural abundance can make its most constructive contribution to the goal of abundance for all.

9716

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 6

The developing nations are challenged to learn how to handle and use food that they receive, as well as to produce more domestically. They are challenged to study and evaluate the techniques, methods and institutions that have proved effective in contributing to abundance productivity and economic growth, and to adapt all of these to the needs of their own people.

Both are challenged to work together and coordinate their efforts toward that end.

There are other tools available to us which we must perfect and use more effectively. It is hardly necessary to emphasize to this Congress the importance of the sharing of knowledge and experience under technical assistance programs. People ranging from world renowned scientists to young Peace Corps volunteers have done yeoman service in the campaign for freedom from hunger, through programs carried out by the United States and many other nations, and through international activities carried out by the FAO and other international bodies.

And, although it is not directly within the province of this World Food Congress, I believe it is in order for us all to bear in mind the importance, to the overall achievement of our goal, of the expansion of world commercial trade. Many of the food deficit nations depend on the export of a single exportable food commodity, such as coffee, and to them international arrangements that would regularize and stabilize trade in that commodity are crucially important. To all nations, developed and developing alike, expanding world trade brings abundance closer to reality.

I would like to conclude by repeating the challenge faced by this World Food Congress, a challenge to each one of us who participates in these deliberations, a challenge to win so complete a victory in our freedom from hunger campaign that we can fix our goal on freedom for the higher levels of living that can characterize an age of abundance—a challenge to use all abundance to create abundance for all.

I have suggested that we consider here several major roadblocks that stand in the way of advance toward our goal. I have urged that we give full recognition to the indispensable role of food and agriculture in economic development. I have tried to point out the importance of learning how to build social, political and economic institutions under which greatest progress can be made. And I have urged that we here and now determine to make full use of the abundance we have—abundance of food and abundance of scientific and technical knowledge—as effective instruments to create abundance for all.

The challenges are not easy ones, but they are supremely important. To meet them we face not only scientific and technological problems, but also the more formidable barriers that are social, political, and economic in their nature.

There are barriers of nationalism—and other isms, barriers of prejudice, of outworn customs, of misunderstanding and lack of understanding. Most important, and intertwined with all of these, is the barrier of ignorance.

I should like to emphasize that the barrier of ignorance applies not only to the illiterate, not only to those who have not yet learned how to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, although this is serious enough. But the barrier of ignorance applies as well to the learned and the powerful—to the statesmen of the world who have not yet learned how to put into effect elements of social engineering that will make it easier to extend the potential for plenty to all people.

The gap of ignorance that cries most urgently to be filled today is the gap between man's ability to create power, on the one hand, and, on the other, his lack of knowl-

edge of how to control that power and direct it to the well-being of all men. For the same power that can destroy a city can light a million homes.

It is our challenge and our responsibility to close that gap.

Let us accept that challenge.

Let it never be said of this generation that we were able to orbit the earth with satellites, but that we were unable to put bread and rice into the hands of hungry children. Let it never be said that a generation that could literally reach for the stars was unable to reach for—and grasp—the potential for plenty, and progress, and peace that is at hand.

AFRICAN GENESIS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the emergence of sovereign nations in Africa is one of the major events of the 20th century. As all of us know, this development is presenting U.S. foreign policy with some sharp challenges to its ingenuity. Above all, it is giving us excellent opportunities to revitalize America's dedication to our revolutionary heritage and our democratic traditions.

I believe, Mr. President, we are meeting our challenges forthrightly in Africa, and are taking a firm stand in favor of freedom and independence for the peoples of that vast continent. And this is as it should be. The magnificent service given to America and the free world by the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, is proudly recognized by the people of Michigan, who knew him as our six-term Governor.

A recent development in Africa deserves our attention and encouragement. I refer to the significant stride toward African unity in the charter signed in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, creating the Organization of African Unity. The desire for unity, both regional and Africa-wide, is dear to the heart of every African leader. I know this well from being a part of the Senate study mission which went to Africa in the fall of 1961.

Americans should be happy to see the lively interest Africans are taking in co-operative endeavors. This course can be an important contribution to a stable and strong continent, and the security of world peace and freedom.

An editorial on this subject appeared in the Washington Post on May 28, 1963. I commend it to Senators, and ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be made a part of my remarks at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AFRICAN GENESIS

While both the Western and Communist worlds are in varying degrees of disarray, the newly independent states of Africa have taken a significant stride toward unity. The initial achievement of the meeting at Addis Ababa was that it was held at all. Until recently, some of the leaders of free Africa were not even on speaking terms; the new nations themselves were divided into rival blocs and the outlook seemed bleak for the unity that all factions professed to want.

But the conference did take place, and 30 independent African states laid the groundwork for a continental organization. For this, much credit is due to Emperor Haile Selassie, who brought the countries

together and kept the sessions on even keel. "Unless political liberty for which Africans have for so long struggled is complemented and bolstered by corresponding economic and social growth," the Ethiopian monarch asserted, "the breath of life which sustains our freedom may flicker out."

The new charter creating the Organization of African Unity will not of itself assure growth; but without some form of coordinating body, growth would be infinitely more difficult. Still, cohesion cannot come quickly among countries as different as Egypt and Liberia, Ghana and the Sudan. What made a successful start possible was agreement to begin gradually on functional problems before tackling (as Mr. Nkrumah had urged) political questions first. By not trying to do too much, the assembled African states were able to do something.

The general tenor of the remarks at Addis Ababa evidenced an increasing pragmatic temper among the African leaders. Most of the countries present may have been born yesterday, but the leadership did not react in a naive way to African problems. While there was unanimity on the question of eliminating colonial remnants from Africa, there was a marked diminution in the tendency to equate the West with wickedness and the East with virtue. It was gratifying to read Premier Sékou Touré's sensible remarks on Birmingham: "We cannot say that the American people are racists—racism exists everywhere, even in Guinea. We know that in the United States a fight is being organized by the Government of President Kennedy. We approve without reserve of this policy by President Kennedy."

Only time will tell if the bright dream of a united Africa will prevail. But the beginning is auspicious and the immediate goals are realistic. That this should have occurred under the aegis of the 71-year-old Emperor of Africa's oldest independent country confirms again Pliny's remark that there is always something new out of Africa.

JEWIS AND JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, tragic, but important, is the report by Dr. Richard C. Hertz, chairman of the Committee on Jews in the Soviet Orbit for the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Dr. Hertz is a learned and distinguished citizen of Michigan, the rabbi of Temple Beth El, and the report he makes summarizing the general situation of Jews behind the Iron Curtain should be of interest and concern to all of us. It throws light on an aspect of the anti-Jewish and anti-Western program of the Kremlin, sometimes unnoted. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report recently published in the yearbook of the Central Conference of American Rabbis be made a part of the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JEWIS AND JUDAISM IN THE SOVIET ORBIT

(By Dr. Richard C. Hertz)

Nearly 3 million Jews in the U.S.S.R. are being slowly strangled spiritually by the Soviet policy of forcible assimilation. Jewish identification is insisted upon by the government but allowed to have no real content. Cultural and religious discrimination against the Jewish minority is widely practiced. Jewish synagogues are gradually being closed, their leaders arrested and disappearing in a mysterious manner reminis-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9717

cent of Stalinism. No Jewish education can be given to the young. No Jewish schools and Jewish organizations are allowed. No Jewish religious books are published. No voluntary associations of Jews are permitted to meet. No contact with other Jewish congregations or with the outside Jewish world is tolerated. No young people are to be found in the synagogues still operating—just old people whom the Kremlin allows to let die off along with their withering Judaism and their faded, tattered talmudism. The young people seem to have little spiritual or moral determination to resist the drying up of the Jewish stream. Many have intermarried or surrendered to the Communist pounding that religion is "the opiate of the masses." Many have swallowed the Lenin-Stalin line about religion and today are largely anti-religious, atheistic, law-abiding Russian citizens.

Meanwhile discrimination against the Jews is widely practiced, especially in the military and diplomatic and higher echelons of education and government. Anti-Jewish feeling in Russia, so deeply rooted since the days of the czars, is still rampant despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. Jews must carry on their internal identification card the stamp "Jew" and thereby subject themselves to discrimination, subtle or overt. Though Jews have minority status, they are permitted none of the rights or privileges of that status, such as having cultural autonomy with their own press or language or gathering place. Jews are not permitted to be reunited with their families who have emigrated to other parts of the world. Their mail is censored. Jews are not permitted to engage in any of the national cultural exchange. Every effort to arrange such an exchange has thus far failed to be approved by the Soviet authorities.

Thus, Soviet Jews appear to be Jews without leadership, without faith, without organization, without commitment, even without the will to survive as Jews. As one college student visiting Russian Jewry wrote home to his parents last summer, "Just as Catholicism in Poland, Judaism grows stronger in the basements and catacombs of refuge than in a synagogue. As for now, the Jews in Russia remain a chosen people—chosen for economic discrimination and cultural extinction."

Although Mr. Khrushchev has expounded at great length on the sins of Stalin, he has completely gilded over and bypassed the sins of Stalin against the Jews in his black years. The Jews of Russia are silent. They cannot speak out, and their spirit is in chains of fear lest the Stalinist methods return.

The real danger of the U.S.S.R.'s type of anti-Semitism is the discriminatory policy militating against the survival of Jews as a national and religious minority. It is a policy of cultural genocide. Soviet anti-Semitism is not just an official policy against its Jewish citizens. It is much more subtle. It is against Jewish culture, Jewish learning, Jewish religion. It is against the men who perpetuate those values—the rabbis, the teachers, the writers, the journalists, the poets, and others who are identified with a distinctly Jewish culture. By way of contrast, Soviet anti-Semitism is different from czarist pogroms. Then it was the destruction of Jews that was determined, but Judaism survived. Now, Jews manage to make a living in the U.S.S.R., but the destruction of Judaism is the target.

The battle for Jewish survival runs low in the U.S.S.R. Time is on the side of the Kremlin. After 45 years of communism, Khrushchev does not have to make the same mistake as Hitler. He can patiently wait out the deaths of those over 60, who remember the days of their youth. Time is slowly de-Judaizing the young Russian Jews who have lost their synagogues, their Yeshivas, their

Rabbis, their prayerbooks, their Bibles, their Talmuds, their Hebrew language. Only folk memories remain as a nostalgic leftover of the once proud and virile Russian Jewry.

Still, as dark as the picture looks, there are a few—the "saving remnant"—who have retained an unshaken loyalty to Judaism and a historic attachment to the Jewish people. They dare not be vocal yet, but they are there, strong, unmistakable, anxious to have contact with Jews outside of their prison walls, famished for some bread of the spirit. As long as they carry on, the time has not yet come to write off 3 million Jews in Russia.

U.S.S.R. AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

What about the U.S.S.R.'s relations with Israel this year? Only as recently as 1948, when Israel declared its independence, the U.S.S.R. rushed to recognize the new Jewish state at once. But Russia's diplomatic support of Israel was not motivated by any love for Jews or for Zionism. Self-interest and self-advantage dictated Soviet moves as in all Soviet diplomatic maneuvering. Russia was anxious to discredit Britain and expose the malfeasance and chaos which British imperialism had brought in its wake. This was effective Communist propaganda.

However, since 1948, the U.S.S.R. has steadily and openly set upon a course of infiltration into the Middle East, wooing the Arabs and trying to establish there a sphere of interest. This past year showed that Soviet power is not influential as the Kremlin might hope. Signs that Nasser is weakening his ties with Moscow came to light. Disappointed with its lack of success in the Middle East, the Kremlin initiated an even stronger propaganda drive against Israel. Arab realists, both in Egypt and in Syria, are beginning to realize that the vast supply of arms and economic aid from Moscow is not motivated by altruistic reasons but has been a purely political maneuver in the cold war. Russia has brought fierce charges against "the Zionists who always use imperialism to consolidate their position in the Middle East."

A new low in anti-Zionist denunciation was reached this year in Moscow broadcasts. Zionist leaders were accused of "maintaining links with German revenge seekers, with Portuguese butchers, with Franco and even with the extremists in Algeria." The Zionists, the broadcasts alleged, were prepared to aid "everyone they thought might be useful with arms, espionage, information and everything else."

Even the Israeli diplomats of the Israel Embassy in Moscow, always trailed by Soviet plainclothesmen, were ordered to sit in a separate section of the Moscow Central Synagogue when they attended Sabbath services. This would segregate them by a corde sanitaire and prevent them from having conversation or contact with Moscow Jews.

The new Soviet drive against Israel this year, therefore, seems like an additional link in the pattern of the anti-Jewish, anti-foreign, anti-Western program of the Kremlin. It could only be construed as a fresh attempt to prevent a settling down of relations in the Middle East, where news of Israel progress and prosperity was already reaching Arab ears. Exploiting anti-Israel sentiment in the United Nations, as well as in the Middle East, seems motivated by the traditional Russian technique of fomenting suspicion and insecurity, two elements which suit Russia's aims and have long been associated with her tactics for winning the world for the Communist conspiracy.

MEN IN WHITE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Washington Post in an editorial on June 3 spotlights again an area where the ef-

forts of all must continue in order that racial barriers be removed. This editorial cites discrimination in making staff appointments in hospitals in the District of Columbia.

The truth is that this problem exists in major cities throughout the Nation. Only yesterday Richard H. Austin, a member of the Michigan Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, testified before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission and broadening its functions. Mr. Austin cited as one of the most urgent civil rights problems in Michigan discrimination in hospital and medical services, including such factors as denials on the basis of race of internship and residency training, professional staff membership, and training of nurses.

He added to the record of the subcommittee hearing the text of a speech by Frances A. Kornegay, executive director of the Detroit Urban League, which cited this as one of the critical problems facing Detroit.

As the Washington Post suggests, in many areas in this country outside of the South, racial discrimination is explained by reference to the low economic condition and the meager education of the Negro. The Washington Post reminds us that such alibis cannot be applied to the Negro professional man and woman. With rigorous scholastic training and professional experience, it is inexcusable that Negro physicians are unable to obtain hospital staff appointments so that they can minister to their own patients.

This editorial reminds us once more of the complex and difficult challenge we face in assuring to all our citizens the right to develop and contribute their full abilities and skills to our community life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Washington Post be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 3, 1963]

MEN IN WHITE

Racial discrimination is usually defended, in this part of the country, with animadversions upon the low economic circumstances of the average Negro and his meager education. Discrimination is most indefensible, then, when it is directed at men who have won admission to the most rigorously self-regulated of all the professions.

Negro physicians find it more difficult than their white colleagues to obtain staff privileges at most of the city's hospitals. Without these privileges, the physician must turn over to other men all those patients requiring hospital care. He also is cut off from the hospital as a center for the dissemination of new knowledge.

In its survey of the 10 private hospitals in Washington, the Urban League's hospital committee concluded that out of some 1,700 active staff positions, 13 were being filled by Negroes. Of about 3,000 courtesy staff positions, 112 were held by Negroes. Application for staff appointments requires in the typical case two letters of recommendation

9718

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 6

from staff members. It is at this point that the Negro application encounters difficulty.

As one hospital explained to the league, turnover on active staffs is slow and sometimes qualified Negro doctors decline appointments because of the demands of their own practices. But it is quite clear that race is among the many reasons for the disparity in these figures. Perhaps it is not totally irrelevant to recall that most of these hospitals were built with substantial Federal and municipal assistance. The scale of the public investment there suggests that they hold a very broad responsibility to contribute actively to the standards of medical practice throughout the entire community.

THE PASSING OF THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an article entitled "The Passing of the General Practitioner" which appeared in the May issue of Medical Times.

This article, by my friend and constituent, Dr. Max Seham, deplores the trend toward ever-increasing specialization in medicine and pays tribute to the devotion and altruism of the oldtime general practitioner.

Dr. Seham points out that the general practitioner "is not a spokesman for organized medicine and rarely reaches high office in medical politics." He is, however, one who knows his patients as individuals rather than case histories and reaps the rewards of personal friendship and social services as many specialists do not.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Seham's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PASSING OF THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER (By Max Seham, M.D.)

The general practitioner through no fault of his own has become a modern casualty. As television has supplanted to a large extent the neighborhood movie, as the jet has encroached on the profits of the earlier aeroplane, so specialization in medicine is rapidly usurping the role of the general practitioner.

In 1928, 74 percent of the medical practitioners were general practitioners, and 26 percent were specialists. As of 1961, 38 percent are general practitioners and 62 percent specialists. Because medical education today favors specialization, because of the increasing trend toward specialization on the part of the majority of the medical students and because of the increasing demand on the part of the public for their services, there is a strong possibility that "the old-fashioned family doctor" may become obsolete.

In my early days of practice the home of the patient played the most important role in the care of the sick. The sick were nursed in the home by the members of the family. A midwife delivered more babies than the family doctor, sometimes with—but usually without his help. Hospitals were used only in emergencies. Nurses were few and far between. Home calls were more popular than office visits. During bad weather the doctor came to the patient and not the patient to the doctor as now. When the doctor removed his office from the neighborhood to the center of the town, the relationship became more impersonal, and when receptionists and nurses took over, the relationship was further formalized. Soon the care of serious diseases shifted from the home to the hos-

pital; with his change, hospital services were reshaped to the needs of the specialists. This shift reduced the doctor's opportunity to acquire firsthand knowledge of the family setting and the economic status of his patients.

In the primitive days of the practice of medicine, the general practitioner was a generalist. He diagnosed and treated not a single organ or a disease, but the whole man in relation to his total environment. His charges were modest; he often paid for the prescription he wrote and he often forgot to send a bill for his services.

Never have I seen such selflessness and altruism displayed by any other group as that shown by the medical profession during and right after the depression. While the bankers were still doing business as usual, getting an eye for an eye, and employers were discharging old and faithful employees who knew not where their next dollar would come from, the doctors were carrying on their books families that were unable to pay for medical care, and at best exchanged their services for the necessities of life. Like my colleagues, in exchange for medical services, I got groceries, clothes and gas for my car.

Unfortunately there are many in the medical profession who look upon the general practitioner as obsolete. It is of course impossible for the general practitioner to possess all the medical know-how. But that does not preclude him from playing an important role in the practice of medicine. On the contrary he is more necessary today than ever. The standards of the general practitioner have been raised and his skill improved through competition with the specialists. The clinical and laboratory methods which were once used only by the specialists such as X-ray, the electrocardiograph and other mechanical and chemical tests, are now part of the equipment of the general practitioner, or at his disposal through special service laboratories. Each year finds the general practitioner adding new weapons to his arsenal. It is left to the general practitioner to bring the resources of modern medicine as far as possible to people in smaller towns and rural areas, and to those in the lower income brackets in the larger cities. The services furnished by the general practitioner determine the quality of medical care for the majority of the people.

Most diseases are self-limited and usually respond favorably to "Vis Medicatrix naturae" (a term coined by Hippocrates, the father of medicine), the curative strength of nature. It is not an exaggeration to say that about 85 percent of all diseases can be successfully diagnosed and treated by the general practitioner. The small number of diseases that are rare and beyond his comprehension can always be referred to a consultant. General practitioners take care of about 75 percent of the children in this country. In the larger centers, it has become customary for the obstetrician to refer newborns to their favorite pediatricians. In the absence of pediatricians the general practitioner can well manage the preventative care and the minor disturbances during infancy.

I believe that patients by and large would get just as efficient and competent care if they depended on a "generalist" in whom they have confidence, one who has been in the family for years, and who is known in the local community for all around competence and integrity. Such a doctor would certainly want to call for consultation if he felt that someone else could do better than he or had more experience in the rarer diseases.

It seems to me that we need more general practitioners rather than more specialists to take care of the increasing number of minor illnesses including psychosomatic disorders. We need more generalists who are more inter-

ested in persons than in technics. The general practitioner will never make as much money as the specialist, but the intangible rewards of friendship and service may be just as great. The old-fashioned general practitioner enjoyed something rare which the modern specialist does not have, something that could not be translated in terms of the dollar, a warm relationship that is absent in the atmosphere of a consulting room or a hospital.

Too many specialists are supercilious about the usefulness and the ability of the general practitioner. They look upon him as a traffic cop directing the patient to the specialist. But to interpret the findings of the specialist, to bring comfort to the patient and his family in times of anxiety, and to mollify the alarm created by the specialist is indeed a worthy and necessary function. Also in this day of radio and television propaganda for drugs and health fads, the public can fall back upon the general practitioner for honest advice regarding the many claims made by drug industries.

The general practitioner is really the keystone of medical practice. It is true he does not make discoveries. He is rarely a writer of medical articles and books. He is not the spokesman for organized medicine and rarely reaches high office in medical politics. He does not profess to be more than he is—an unheralded public servant dedicated to the medical needs of the simple, decent, loyal people in his community.

Taking up the cudgel for the general practitioner, a recent president of the Academy of General Practice lashed out at the "selfish and unscrupulous men in the profession whose greed is exceeded by their lack of integrity." He charged that increasing emphasis on specialization "forces the public to pay more than it should for medical care, wastes time and effort for both doctor and patient, and causes national maldistribution of doctors." * * * The intense competition between the general practitioner and the specialists for patients," he adds, "has been largely responsible for such evils as exorbitant fees, unnecessary fee splitting." This cold war is more than a personal economic feud among private practitioners. It denotes a failure of the present fee-for-service system in which some doctors get higher fees than others for the same kind of service, wherein some doctors gain more prestige than others even though they are not more deserving and where the specialists have become the chosen in political power and wealth.

It seems to me that the problem should not be labeled general practitioner versus specialist. It can only be solved for the benefit of the people, by cooperation and integration, each to do what he can do best for the welfare of the sick and the prevention of illness. It would be a tragedy if the reward for his many sacrifices and individual accomplishments would be liquidation by the competitive fee-for-service system.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HART BEFORE 58TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on May 18 the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] spoke at the 58th Annual Conference of the League for Industrial Democracy. His address includes his careful reflections on a number of important issues, including those of civil rights and congressional reform. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.